71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The regular Session of the 92nd General Assembly will please come to order. Will the Members please be at their desks? Will our guests in the galleries please rise? Our prayer today will be given by Pastor Nelsen, Cherry Hills Baptist Church, Springfield, Illinois. Pastor Nelsen.

### PASTOR JEFF NELSEN:

(Prayer by Pastor Jeff Nelsen)

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Please remain standing for the Pledge of Allegiance. Senator Radogno.

#### SENATOR RADOGNO:

(Pledge of Allegiance, led by Senator Radogno)

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Illinois Information Service has requested filming the Session. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Reading of the Journal.

### SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Journals of Wednesday, February 20th, and Thursday, February 21st, 2002.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Myers.

#### SENATOR MYERS:

Mr. President, I move that the Journals just read by the Secretary be approved, unless some Senator has additions or corrections to offer.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Myers moves to approve the Journals just read. There being no objection, so ordered. Committee Reports.

### SECRETARY HARRY:

Senator Cronin, Chair of the Committee on Education, reports
Senate Bill 1524 Do Pass, as Amended.

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

Senator Parker, Chair of the Committee on Transportation, reports Senate Bill 1588 Do Pass, and Senate Bills 1550 and 1624 Do Pass, as Amended.

And Senator Hawkinson, Chair of the Committee on Judiciary, reports Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 2058 Be Approved for Consideration.

#### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Messages from the House.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

Message from the House by Mr. Rossi, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has accepted the Governor's specific recommendations for change, which are attached, to a bill of the following title, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence, to wit:

House Bill 3247.

Adopted by the House, February -- or, February 21st, 2002.

A Message from the House by Mr. Rossi, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has passed a bill of the following title, in the passage of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Bill 3771.

Passed the House, February 21st, 2002.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Senator Demuzio, for what purpose do you rise? Senator Demuzio, for what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. Like the record to reflect that Senator Bowles again is absent today due to illness, that Senator Viverito is absent due to legislative business back home.

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

The record will so indicate. Resolutions.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolution 335, offered by Senator Roskam.

It's a death resolution, Mr. President.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

Consent Calendar.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Resolution 336, offered by Senators Hendon and Trotter. They're both  $\{\text{sic}\}$  substantive.

### PRESIDENT PHILIP:

If I could have your attention for a minute, I'm going to turn the podium over, temporarily, to Senator Clayborne for the purpose of an exciting introduction. Senator Clayborne.

### SENATOR CLAYBORNE:

Thank you, President Philip. It is indeed my pleasure... Get used to this, Wendell. It is -- it is indeed my pleasure this morning, and an honor for us as Senators, for -- for me to introduce one of Illinois' greatest citizens and one of this -- of the world's greatest athletes that has ever participated in the -- in the -- arena sports -- sports of arena. Not only is she a -- a great athlete, she's a very conscious, humble and -- a person who has given back all that she has to not only the sport, but to her community and to her fellow man. She's a three-time Olympic Gold Medalist, two-time Silver Medalist, and one Bronze. Without further ado, I'd like to introduce you to the world's greatest, greatest athlete, Jackie Joyner-Kersee, and her husband, Bobby Kersee.

(Remarks and Introductions by Jackie Joyner-Kersee & Bobby Kersee)
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Parker, what purpose do you rise? SENATOR PARKER:

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

Personal privilege.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

State your point.

SENATOR PARKER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I have with me today on the Floor a young man, Luis Brito, who is the Youth of the Year for the Department of Human Service Teen Reach Program, from the Boys and Girls Club of Lake County. And in the President's Gallery, Chris Finkel and Ed Shumaker, who are also involved in the program. In fact, Ed Shumaker was the founder of the Boys and Girls Club in Lake County.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Welcome to Springfield. Membership will turn to the middle of page 2, to the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading. Chair was unaware of all the Members who wanted to have their photographs taken with Senator Clayborne. The Chair would request any additional Members or -- or staff that would like to take photographs with our Olympic Medalist, please go in the hallway so we can conduct Senate business. Thank you. Middle of page 2, in the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading. Senator Roskam, do you wish this bill returned to 2nd Reading for the purposes of an amendment? Senator Roskam seeks leave of the Body to return House Bill 2058 to the Order of 2nd Reading for the purpose of an amendment. Hearing no objection, leave is granted. On the Order of 2nd Reading is House Bill 2058. Mr. Secretary, are there any Floor amendments that have been approved for consideration?

SECRETARY HARRY:

Amendment No. 2, offered by Senator Roskam.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I have before you Floor Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 2058. is a bill that -- and a concept that's familiar to all of us in this Chamber, following September 11th. Last November, unanimously adopted almost everything in this bill. The -- it was the Attorney General's antiterrorism package that went over to the House, and actually nobody opposed it in the House. There was one Present vote, I understand. And as you all know, that met with the Governor's veto. The Governor made five amendatory changes to that bill. This is not an override; this is a new bill. those changes or recommendations of the Governor are included in this bill, and one is not included. Let me just walk through those four changes that I'm recommending to you and we can discuss all of them, and I'll do my best to answer any questions. The first is, in terms of the forfeiture language, you'll recall that there was a seizure/forfeiture action that was allowed in that underlying bill that Senator Hawkinson had, and this would put limit on that so it has to be commenced within sixty days of the initiation of the underlying civil freeze order. The -- the -that time frame, in my view, makes sense. The other change is It requires that in terms of the changes in wiretaps and minor. eavesdropping that we all supported last November, the Governor recommended that we include language that would limit the overhearing to an electronic criminal surveillance Again, I think that's a good suggestion, and it makes sense. Third area has to do with the doctor-patient privilege, and what we've done is made it an express exception relating to a terrorism investigation so that there's no ambiguity about the relationships that -- or, the -- the -- the privilege in that relationship. And then, finally, under the FOID Card Act, what we're doing is we're saying that a non-immigrant applicant for a FOID Card has an obligation to disclose that under the card. Obviously, the

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

portion that the Governor recommended that is not a part of this is the elimination of the death penalty provision for bill terrorism. The death penalty provision is in this bill. So, my -my sense is that several of the Governor's recommendations, in my view, were meritorious, and I would urge their adoption. I'll do my best to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.

Will the sponsor yield for questions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

Senator Roskam, we discussed this a little bit in committee, so I just want to make sure that everybody is clear. you gave a -- a fair presentation just now, but I want to underscore -- what I understand to be happening and maybe you can confirm my understanding. The Governor took the bill that we had passed previously out of this Chamber, out of the House. It went to his desk. He amendatorily vetoed it, and he made a number of changes, all of which have -- are -- are reflected in this bill with the exception of the death penalty. Is that accurate?

Senator Roskam.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Obama.

SENATOR OBAMA:

So, essentially, we are confronted with a couple of options.

One would be if the House released the version that they have

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

received back from the Governor and put it to an override vote, and if that was successful and it came over here, then we would be voting to override the Governor's bill. That's option number one. Option number two would be the override would fail, in which case the Governor's version would be adopted. Option number three, then, is for us to vote on this bill, which will then get sent over to the House and sent to the Governor's desk, presumably reflecting the changes with the exception of the death penalty. Is that an accurate...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Roskam.

SENATOR ROSKAM:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Obama.

### SENATOR OBAMA:

So, I'll -- I'll just make a very brief comment. When -- when we had the debate in the previous bill, I think all of us overwhelmingly were supportive of the notion that we need to empower our local law enforcement officials to at least supplement what the federal government's doing in terms of fighting terrorism. And although the bill is not ideal, I think Senator Hawkinson, working with Members from both sides of the aisle, helped to craft a piece of legislation that many of us could support. I stated at that time that the difficulty I had with the bill continued to be the death penalty, not because I thought that someone like Osama bin Laden might not be an appropriate candidate for the death penalty, but because, as the Governor stated in his Budget Address, there are many of us who still have concerns about implementation of the death penalty. And so I -- I am sorry that, once again, those of us who are supportive of the underlying legislation are being put in a position where, essentially, they

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

have to either vote for a death penalty provision at a time that we support the moratorium or, alternatively, be perceived as being opposed to terrorism legislation that we actually support. And I -- I think it's unfortunate that we continue to construct what I consider to be political gamesmanship around an issue of this importance. That isn't to say that I think there can't be legitimate differences both on the death penalty and on the I just think that if we're going to debate those moratorium. issues, we should do so forthrightly and do them separately, rather than folding them into a bill that many people are going to find, politically, difficult to reject.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Further discussion? Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I have supported the death penalty for heinous crimes, and madmen and murderers who attack planes with innocent women and children on them, like terrorists did, unlike the Japanese kamikaze who would hit military installations and ships, would seem to me that it's not a Whether we like it or not, we are political matter anymore. engaged in war. It was done to us September the 11th and done in a very obvious and overt fashion. I certainly feel that the death penalty would be justified for terrorists who inflict murder and mayhem on our people, and I don't see why there's such a political ramification to it. Is it political to want to have justice for the people who lost their lives in the Pentagon, in the World Trade, in the plane that went down in Pennsylvania? political? I don't think it's political at all. I think it's a matter of common sense and justice, and I urge the favorable approval of this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Further discussion? Senator Cullerton.

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

### SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I would rise in support of the -- the bill because the provisions in the bill that are in addition to the terrorist bill that we passed are improvements. So the Governor should be complimented for pointing that out in his amendatory veto, and we are doing the right thing by accepting those. Now, with regard to the -- the death penalty provision in the bill, I really think it's more symbolic than anything else. It's really hard to imagine a circumstances, a crime, covered by this Terrorist Act that's not already covered by the death penalty. We've got twenty provisions in the bill right -- in the law right now that allows for the death penalty, and just about any set of facts you can think of that would be a terrorist act is already covered by the death So, you know, you may not agree with the Governor's position but he's the Governor, and he's got to sign the bill before it becomes law. So what we're -- we're doing here is passing a bill which he clearly is going to have an issue with because it's got the death penalty in it. We might be, once again, confronting an amendatory veto and not having a bill with an immediate effective date, as this bill contains. So, probably the better course would have been to accept his amendatory veto, declare victory, announce to the world that the death penalty would apply to just about any terrorist act that you could imagine, and -- and we'd have a law. So, the tactic that you're taking I don't think is probably the best one, in light of the Governor's position, but for us, right now, we clearly should support this bill because it's an improvement over the terrorist bill that we passed last year.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Roskam, you wish to close on the amendment? Senator Roskam.

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, this bill is not about the Governor. This bill is about Osama bin Laden and the men who are manipulating and making things happen, and scurrying around behind closed doors, and mocking us and sending people to their death. That's what this bill is about. This bill is in place to take away any ambiguity about what the terrorist law should state. There are those who have said, "Well, it's duplicative and there's no need for it." Then so be it. Then vote Yes. But if there is any ambiguity in the law, if there is any possibility that there could be a heinous terrorist act that would take place in the State of Illinois and it would fall through the cracks, I think it would be irresponsible, on our part, not to enact this and to put it into place. So we've --we've discussed this at length. Everybody's well familiar with what's in the bill, and I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a vote on the amendment. So, all those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have... Senator Demuzio, what purpose do you rise?

### SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Has anyone requested a -- a roll call with respect to this, rather than just on the adoption?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

No. No, this -- there has been no roll call requested of the Chair. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted. Any further Floor amendments approved for consideration?

### SECRETARY HARRY:

No further amendments reported.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

3rd Reading. Senator Demuzio, what purpose you rise? Put

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

your light... Okay. Now on the Order of 3rd Reading, House Bill 2056 {sic}. Mr. Secretary, read the bill.

### SECRETARY HARRY:

House Bill 2058.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Roskam.

#### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Mr. President. The bill -- Amendment No. 2 became the bill. Please vote Aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill -- Senator Emil Jones.

### SENATOR E. JONES:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. There are many provisions within this bill which I wholeheartedly support, but there is one provision in here which I -- I dislike, and it sort of places the Members in a -- in a situation where if you vote against the bill, then you are against the terrorists and all the parts of this bill that would deal with that issue. But we should not be playing politics with this, nor should we be playing politics with the lives of people who may inadvertently be placed on death row and -- and -- only later to find out that those persons are innocent. And I listened very carefully at the address of the Governor when he spoke on this issue, and he said, as long as he's Governor, he does not want to be placed in a position wherein some innocent person would -- would be put to death. And I know many Members on this side stood up and applaud, but Members on your side of the aisle sat there in silence, as if you do not care whether or not a innocent person is put to death. And that is frightening. It is frightening. Sure, we're concerned about 9/11. Sure, we are

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

concerned about the terrorists. But by the same token, when you add another category as far as the death penalty is concerned, when our criminal justice system is broke, when the commission appointed by the Governor has not even reported back, but you want to increase the category. That's the problem with the bill, But when you play politics with the lives of perhaps itself. innocent persons, you're not really doing justice - 'cause I watched you sit there in silence. I would have assumed that you would have stood up and said, "Yes, we do not want any persons placed on death row or even executed." So, we shouldn't be sitting around here talking about the terrorists, Osama bin Laden and all this other stuff 'cause if you vote against the bill, it is against Osama bin Laden. No, that's not the case. It's a case in the State of Illinois where you have so many innocent persons who have been found not guilty, many who have served many years in prison. There is no way you can compensate those individuals. Death is final. But I'm shocked shocked - to hear you sit up here and play politics with the lives of people. It should not be that way. A lot of innocent people, sure, died in the World Trade Center, and I grant you that. A lot of provisions in this bill which many Members are -- are for. death penalty should been -- should have been debated separately, not inclusive within this bill. That's the politics that's being played. But I'm very shocked - I'm shocked - that you would do I am -- I'm shocked that you did not stand up and say, "Yes, we do not want innocent persons placed on death row without all the safeguards to protect them." You want to add another category. I intend to vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Further discussion? Senator Burzynski.

### SENATOR BURZYNSKI:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move the previous question.

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

There are three additional speakers. Further discussion? Senator O'Malley.

### SENATOR O'MALLEY:

you, Mr. President. I rise in support of this Thank initiative and I want to compliment Senator Roskam for carrying it and explaining it so well to the Body, and I support it wholeheartedly. And I have to agree with you - what kind of message are we sending in the State of Illinois if we do not include the death penalty as something that's available to a judge and a jury to consider in cases where there'd be terrorism and the killing of innocent human beings around this State? And with all due respect to the previous speaker, I'm sure he did not understand what he was saying when he said the following, more or less, and I'm paraphrasing: that other people on the other of the aisle, in any way, shape or form, somehow would be associated with wanting to see an innocent person put to death on death row. There's nobody on this side of the aisle -- I haven't -- I don't have any right to speak for anybody here, but I don't know any citizen in this State who would want to put an innocent person to death on death row, and I want to make that perfectly And I -- and I hope the previous speaker will accept the fact that I have made these remarks to make sure that his remarks were clear and the positions of the Members on this side of the aisle are absolutely clear.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Further discussion? Senator Hawkinson.

### SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. I want to also address that point. There is absolutely no logical inconsistency between support for the moratorium and the improvements that we're all trying to make in our death penalty system and support for this bill. This bill

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

adds a category that is death-penalty eligible, and if there's any category that ought to be death-penalty eligible, this is terrorists kill innocent civilians, they ought to be death-penalty eligible. Nothing in that position is inconsistent with either support for the moratorium or support for improving our capital justice system. We in this Body passed the Capital Litigation Trust Fund Act that provides the resources at the trial court level, for both defense and prosecution, which ensures or goes a long way to ensuring that those kinds of mistakes will never be repeated at the trial court level. There's money for investigators, defense counsels, testing experts and the like. also have had Supreme Court rules -- decisions which provide the qualifications for defense counsel who handle these kinds of cases. So, we've gone a long way already to improving the system, and I'm sure, when the commission comes down with further recommendations, we will consider those recommendations as well. But there is no inconsistency between support for improving the system and for adding a very necessary category that when terrorists strike at innocent civilians, that that ought to be at least death-penalty eligible. And I urge your support for House Bill 2058.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Further discussion? Senator Petka.

### SENATOR PETKA:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I was very, very saddened, very troubled, by the marks {sic} of the Minority Leader. To believe that we are people without a conscience because we have a -- a disagreement, perhaps, with the -- the Governor's position on capital punishment, I think that the remarks that were made were -- to myself were very offensive - in fact, bordered on outrageous. The chief sponsor of this legislation and myself - he was a House Member and I was a Member

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

of the Senate - came forward and sponsored a bill actually opposed by law enforcement which provided that people who are on death row and others who had been convicted of certain evidence -- or, certain crimes where DNA evidence could possibly exonerate them, we sponsored the legislation that permitted them to have legal standing, even though they had long passed the time when they could challenge their convictions. We did it for a very simple reason. We believe that trials and the criminal process is search for the truth and that DNA evidence permitted the truth to come free. Again, law enforcement community members were -were opposed to this because they felt that there was too much expense, that there was -- this was going to be a waste of time. In our opinion, all those considerations were simply subservient to the most important thing, and that is, if individuals who are death row or serving long prison sentences were, in fact, innocent, then they should be exonerated and taken off of death row or out of prison. We stand very strongly for the proposition of equal protection and equal justice. We stand very -- very, very strongly for the proposition that a person is presumed innocent until he's proven guilty. And I -- I just think that it it is a -- is a statement that deserves an apology, quite frankly. I have stood in the position on a dozen times where I had to make a decision about whether or not a person should face the capital punishment. I can tell you it was never taken It was something that was thought out carefully, but lightly. when I -- I became convinced that it was the proper thing to do, that the people of the State of Illinois demanded justice in those cases, it was the only thing to do. So, sir, I would hope that in the future you'd be more sensitive to our side of the aisle on those positions where we fought hard, very hard, to prove the innocence of people who had been wrongfully convicted. might add, parenthetically, almost all of those convictions

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

occurred in Cook County.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Roskam, to close.

### SENATOR ROSKAM:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. You know, there's really nothing shocking that's in this bill at It's material that was negotiated through dozens and dozens and dozens of meetings. There were -- we -- it received high praise from a procedural point of view and -- and people who were letting -- willing to let, sort of, donkeys and elephants wilt away on this one and come together and do a good job and negotiate a good bill. Both sides of the aisle were well engaged through this entire process. This was not a slam dunk by one party, by any stretch of the imagination. There's nothing shocking in this bill. In fact, it -- it's -- it's something that we all discussed back in November. We all unanimously agreed on every provision in this bill, with the exception of four improvements, as one of the previous speakers said. There's four new, good ideas in here that the Governor came up with. So there's nothing - absolutely nothing - shocking, nothing new, nothing unusual. What we need to do is to stand up, do the right thing, realize and recognize that we are a coequal branch of government and let's assert the equality that the Constitution has empowered us with, and I'm asking for your Aye vote. Thank you.

### PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

The question is, shall House Bill 2058 pass. All those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Aye. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 49 Ayes, 2 Nays, and 2 voting -- Present. And House Bill 2058, having received the required constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. We'll now proceed to the Order of Resolutions Consent

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

Calendar. With leave of the Body, all of those read in today will be added to the Consent Calendar. Mr. Secretary, have there been any objections filed to any resolution on the Consent Calendar? SECRETARY HARRY:

No objections have been filed, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Any discussion? If not, the -- the question is, shall the resolutions on the Consent Calendar be adopted. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The motion carries, and the resolutions are adopted. Resolutions.

### SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Joint Resolution 55, offered by Senator Weaver.

(Secretary reads SJR No. 55)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Senator Weaver moves to suspend the rules for the purpose of the immediate consideration and adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 55. All those in favor will say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the rules are suspended. Now Senator Weaver has moved for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 55. All those in favor, say Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it, and the resolution is adopted. Resolutions.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

Senate Joint Resolution 54, Constitutional Amendment, offered by Senator Jacobs.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Mr. Secretary, Chair requests that these -- that that -- Mr. Secretary, have there been any motions filed?

### SECRETARY HARRY:

Yes, Mr. President. Senator Donahue has filed a motion with respect to House Bill 3247.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DUDYCZ)

Mr. Secretary, the Chair requests that these motions be --

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

that that motion be printed on the Calendar. So ordered. For the information of the Membership, we have effectively concluded the business of the day and of the week, substantively. We will be in perfunct to be able to read in -- read in legislation, and when we do adjourn finally, we will be coming back on Tuesday, February 22nd {sic}, 2002, at the hour of noon. But drive carefully. We have effectively concluded the business of the day. We are in perfunctory Session now. Introduction of Bills.

#### ACTING SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Bill 2329, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2330, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2331, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2332, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2333, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2334, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2335, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2336, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2337, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2338, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2339, offered by Senators Weaver and Rauschenberger.

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

Senate Bill 2340, offered by Senators Weaver and Rauschenberger.

- Senate Bill 2341, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2342, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2343, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2344, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2345, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2346, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2347, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2348, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2349, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2350, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2351, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2352, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2353, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2354, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2355, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2356, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2357, offered by Senators Weaver and Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2358, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2359, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2360, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2361, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2362, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2363, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2364, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2365, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2366, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2367, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2368, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2369, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2370, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

Senate Bill 2371, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2372, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2373, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2374, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2375, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2376, offered by Senators Maitland and Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2377, offered by Senators Watson and Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2378, offered by Senator Donahue.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2379, offered by Senators Weaver and Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2380, offered by Senators Myers and Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2381, offered by Senator Donahue.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2382, offered by Senators Mahar and Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2383, offered by Senator Weaver.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2384, offered by Senator Weaver.

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2385, offered by Senators Dudycz, Rauschenberger and Silverstein.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2386, offered by Senators Weaver and Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2387, offered by Senator Burzynski.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2388, offered by Senators Luechtefeld, Bowles and Bomke.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2389, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2390, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2391, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2392, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2393, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2394, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2395, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2396, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2397, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

Senate Bill 2398, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

- Senate Bill 2399, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2400, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2401, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2402, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2403, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2404, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2405, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2406, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2407, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2408, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2409, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2410, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2411, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2412, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- Senate Bill 2413, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)
- And Senate Bill 2414, offered by Senator Rauschenberger.

  (Secretary reads title of bill)

71st Legislative Day

February 22, 2002

1st Reading of the bills.

#### SECRETARY HARRY:

...the Order of House Bills 1st Reading is:

House Bill 1442, offered by Senators Roskam and Philip.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

House Bill 1448, by Senators Roskam and Philip.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

And House Bill 3710, by Senator Jacobs.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

1st Reading of the bills.

On the Order of Resolutions is:

Senate Joint Resolution 56, offered by Senator Weaver.

It's substantive.

With no further business, pursuant to the adjournment resolution, the Senate stands adjourned until Tuesday next at the hour of noon.